

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/051,778	BECKMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Lett	2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas J. Lett. (3) _____.

(2) Michael D'Aurelio. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: DeLorme (USPN 5,948,040 A).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.




KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney D'Aurelio contacted Examiner regarding the Advisory Action dated 01 March 2007 in which the Amendment after final was not entered by Examiner. Attorney D'Aurelio insisted that the non-entry was improper and that the amendment should have been entered. Examiner viewed the amendment after final as not in condition for allowance and requiring further search since allowable subject matter was placed into non-statutory claims. Examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of the office action and issue a new non-final rejection which reflects the applied prior art rejection of DeLorme et al as well as a 35 USC 101 rejection of non-statutory program claims.